

March 2017

**CAMPAIGN TO RECLAIM OUR DEMOCRACY:
FREE SPEECH FOR PEOPLE OVERVIEW OF OUR WORK**

Free Speech For People has emerged over the past seven years as a recognized leader of the movement to reclaim our democracy by challenging big money in politics, unchecked corporate power, and corruption at the highest levels of our government. We are the leading force in the courts to advance a new jurisprudence on money in politics. We continue to help lead the growing national movement for a 28th Amendment to the US Constitution to restore democracy to the people. And, in the face of the new and unprecedented corruption of the presidency and our government, Free Speech For People is at the forefront leading cutting-edge campaigns to confront that corruption and to demand accountability under the law.

Organizational Background and Context For the Work

Free Speech For People works to renew our democracy and our United States Constitution for we the people. Founded on the day of the Supreme Court's *Citizens United* ruling, Free Speech For People envisions a democratic process in which all people have an equal voice and an equal vote. We advance this mission with the following innovative, effective, and complementary strategies:

- We catalyze and help lead the movement to amend the U.S. Constitution to overturn the Supreme Court's rulings in *Citizens United v. FEC* and *Buckley v. Valeo*, and the doctrines underlying those rulings;
- We engage in legal advocacy in the courts to advance a new jurisprudence on money in politics and to confront the misuse of the U.S. Constitution to claim corporate exemptions from our laws;
- We develop and advocate for model laws and other tools to challenge big money in politics and to make corporations responsible to the public;
- We challenge corruption at the highest levels of our government and lead bold campaigns for accountability under the law.

Free Speech For People has led the attack on *Citizens United* both as a dangerous campaign finance decision and as an extreme extension of the fabricated doctrine of corporate constitutional rights. The US Supreme Court, in *Citizens United v. FEC*, eliminated critical protections for people by allowing corporations unprecedented influence in the political process. The *Citizens United* ruling also introduced the most extreme extension yet of a fabricated corporate rights doctrine that has placed corporations over people.

Following the November 2016 election, the nation is now witnessing massive corruption at the highest levels of government. By refusing to fully divest from his business interests, President Donald Trump has been in direct violation of the U.S. Constitution's Foreign Emoluments Clause and Domestic Emoluments Clause from the moment he took the oath of office and is profiting from the presidency at the public's expense. In defense of the Constitution and to challenge this corruption which threatens our democracy, Free Speech For People, with our organizational partner RootsAction, launched a campaign on January 20, 2017, calling on Congress to begin impeachment proceedings. In addition, we launched a second campaign to revoke the corporate charter of the

Trump Organization for failing to comply with its legal obligations under New York state law and the significant conflicts of interest posed by Trump's continued investment in the company.

Through all of this work, Free Speech For People is a leading force in the country for defending our Constitution and reclaiming the basic promise of democracy and American self-government: of, by, and for the people.

Challenging Corruption at the Highest Levels of Government

The Campaign to Impeach Donald Trump Now

On January 20, 2017, Free Speech For People and our organizational partner, RootsAction, [launched a campaign to impeach President Donald Trump](#) based on his refusal to divest from his business interests while serving as president, placing him in direct [violation of the Foreign Emoluments Clause and the Domestic Emoluments Clause of the U.S. Constitution](#). The clear purpose of these provisions of the Constitution is to prevent corruption. Many of the Trump Organization's extensive business dealings with foreign governments, businesses owned by foreign governments, and other foreign leaders violate the Foreign Emoluments Clause. Similarly, the Constitution's Domestic Emoluments Clause provides that the President shall not profit from the presidency or receive any other emolument from the United States. President Trump has chosen to continue owning businesses that receive government subsidies and tax breaks in violation of this provision.

Furthermore, "emoluments" are not limited to monetary payments; they also [include economically valuable favorable regulatory actions](#). President Trump's control over the vast modern powers of the executive branch means that regulatory action affecting his businesses favorably constitutes an "Emolument from the United States." President Trump has been unwilling to separate his presidential duty from his business interests. His unlawful conduct undermines the integrity of the presidency and the executive branch, abuses the public trust, and has created a constitutional crisis for the nation. In the face of this direct defiance of the rule of law, our campaign calls on Congress to pass a resolution initiating an impeachment investigation of President Trump.

The launch of our campaign spurred a grassroots movement to challenge corruption in government, with more than 900,000 people signing on at the campaign website, impeachdonaldtrumpnow.org, in support of the call for an impeachment investigation of President Trump. In addition, people across the country are organizing in their local communities to pass resolutions at the local level calling on Congress to begin impeachment proceedings. Following [a national TeleTown Hall](#) hosted by Free Speech For People and RootsAction on February 13, 2017, to discuss with activists ways to take action in their communities, the city of Richmond, California, on February 22, 2017, became the first in the nation to pass our impeachment resolution. The communities of Alameda, California and Charlotte, Vermont passed similar resolutions on March 8, 2017. Resolutions are now being introduced across the country in response to these initial victories. [Click here](#) to read more about the campaign to Impeach Donald Trump Now in the Washington Post.

Corporate Charter Revocation: Calling for the launch of an investigation into the Trump Organization

On February 15, 2017, Free Speech For People launched [a campaign to demand that the attorney general of New York open an investigation into whether to dissolve and revoke the corporate charter of the Trump Organization](#), due to President Trump's unconstitutional conflicts of interest, as he retains an ownership stake in the business, and the Trump Organization's history of illegal activities. The campaign calls on New York Attorney General Eric Schneiderman to pursue an

investigation in New York state court regarding violations by the Trump Organization of state law, including continuing to operate under Trump family ownership, violating the public policies of New York State against corruption and conflicts of interest, and violation of the Foreign Emoluments Clause and Domestic Emoluments Clause of the U.S. Constitution. Further, the Trump Organization has a documented history of alleged illegal and fraudulent activities which demonstrate the company has acted outside its legal authority. For this effort, we have partnered with Prof. Jed Shugerman of Fordham Law School, an expert on both the emoluments clauses and the creative state law legal tool (“quo warranto”) that underlies our request. We have also partnered in this campaign with the Boston law firm of Clements & Pineault and the New York City law firm of Emery Celli Brinckerhoff & Abady.

The campaign was [featured in the Washington Post](#) and [Slate](#), and promoted by a widely-shared [op-ed in the New York Daily News](#).

On March 17, 2017, [Free Speech For People delivered a second letter](#) to the New York State Attorney General, following the release of new details regarding alleged bribery activities conducted by the Trump Organization. These revelations have created a renewed urgency for the call to revoke the Organization’s corporate charter. As [reported](#) recently, the Trump Organization’s activities in the failed Trump Tower Baku project in Baku, Azerbaijan may have included participating in bribery of Azerbaijani officials – which would violate the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, and violating Iran sanctions by dealing with a construction company that is a front for Iran’s Revolutionary Guard. Two days after we delivered this second letter, the attorney general [announced](#) that he had hired a former top federal prosecutor with a public corruption background to focus on the Trump Administration.

In addition, on March 17, 2017, we sent [a letter to Joon Kim, Acting U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of New York](#), which sets forth the Baku allegations, and also outlines potential bribery and extortion violations arising from the suspicious timing of the Chinese government granting the Trump Organization certain trademarks, following many years of refusing to grant these trademarks, and President Trump’s recent testing of the idea of abandoning the United States’ “One China” policy.

Free Speech For People is currently exploring additional litigation opportunities to challenge the corporate charter of the Trump Organization in other states in which it operates.

FEC Complaint for Investigation of Coordination between the Russian Government and Trump Campaign

Free Speech For People, with the Campaign for Accountability, filed on December 16, 2016, [a complaint before the Federal Election Commission](#) demanding an investigation into whether the Russian government illegally spent money to influence the 2016 presidential election, in possible coordination with the Trump campaign. Per reports from the U.S. government, the Russian government deliberately attempted to influence the 2016 presidential campaign in favor of Donald Trump, in violation of the Federal Election Campaign Act, which prohibits foreign nationals from spending money to influence federal elections.

The complaint will soon be amended with new details regarding this collusion from the Office of the Director of National Intelligence’s January 2017 report and from the March 2017 Congressional hearing regarding the FBI’s investigation of the Russian government’s role in the presidential election. If the Federal Election Commission fails to act on our complaint within the statutory 120-

day period, we may file a federal lawsuit, as we have already done with our federal challenge to super PACs and the *SpeechNow* decision that created them.

Legal Strategies in Development to Challenge Trump Corruption

We are currently exploring and preparing several initiatives using state law claims and state courts (in some cases, working with a state attorney general; in other cases, bringing our own litigation) to fight against Trump corruption. This is an attractive route because the various states in which the Trump Organization operates provide legal frameworks and tools that can be more favorable than the federal laws. We are also looking into innovative test cases that can be brought on behalf of ordinary Americans affected by Trump's corruption.

In this area, as in our money in politics litigation, we will bring the same creativity, legal expertise, and bold leadership that lies behind our national [challenge to super PACs](#) and our innovative [local](#) and [state](#) test case legislation that would end super PACs and political spending by foreign-influenced corporations.

Advancing a New Jurisprudence on Money in Politics and American Self-Government

Free Speech For People's Legal Advocacy Program, supported by an impressive [Legal Advisory Committee](#), engages in legal advocacy, public education, and organizing to challenge in the courts the US Supreme Court's rulings in *Citizens United v. FEC*, *McCutcheon v. FEC*, and *Buckley v. Valeo* and the legal doctrines underlying those rulings, and to serve as a critical legal resource for the growing movement in the United States to reclaim our democracy. We carry out this work in four key ways:

- Pushing back in the courts to challenge the fabrication of corporate constitutional rights and the doctrine of unlimited campaign spending, and to advance the promise of political equality for all;
- Building support in the legal community for a new jurisprudence;
- Developing model legislation for the defense of our democracy;
- Serving as a key legal resource for the growing constitutional amendment movement.

In the short-term, we aim, via our Legal Advocacy Program, to create building blocks for a new jurisprudence on money in politics. Such building blocks include: judicial rulings at the federal and state court level which chip away at the doctrines underlying the *Citizens United* ruling and related rulings; judicial dissents which challenge such doctrines; and academic scholarship which advances new arguments for overturning the doctrines. In the long-term, our objective with our Legal Advocacy Program is to establish a new jurisprudence for our democracy consistent with America's promises of self-government and political equality for all. For further discussion on this overall legal strategy, [see this article: "After 'Citizens United': From Law Reviews to Litigation,"](#) by Free Speech For People's Legal Director Ron Fein, published by the American Constitution Society.

How we win campaign finance cases before the Supreme Court in the post-election political reality

In 2015, prior to Justice Antonin Scalia's passing, Free Speech For People began developing a legal strategy to bring new test cases that could win at the Supreme Court under the Roberts Court as it existed at that time. These test cases were not targeted at a new post-Scalia Justice; the cases were built under the assumption that Justice Anthony Kennedy and/or Chief Justice John Roberts would join our side to prevail.

Following the November 2016 election, the core strategy of these cases remains the same—legal arguments designed to persuade one of the justices from the *Citizens United* majority—and they are even more vital to pursue today. While we might have hoped for a different Supreme Court, this strategy offers a path forward to achieve real progress, chip away at the foundations of *Citizens United* now, and lay building blocks for a future Court to overturn *Citizens United* itself.

The following is a summary of our three main legal advocacy projects, and the strategies to win under the current Supreme Court or a Supreme Court with a new ninth Justice nominated by President Donald Trump and confirmed by the United States Senate.

A legal challenge to Speechnow: Free Speech For People’s Ending Super PACs Project

In March 2010, the US Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit, in the case of *Speechnow.org v. FEC*, unleashed super PACs into our political process. The Supreme Court has yet to review the *Speechnow* ruling, and the ruling has led to the current explosion of super PAC spending in our elections. [In July 2016, Free Speech For People filed a complaint before the Federal Election Commission to abolish super PACs.](#) We argue that the *Speechnow* ruling was wrongly decided and that super PACs have become vehicles for wealthy donors to evade longstanding limits on campaign contributions to candidates, presenting a new threat of corruption of the political process. Both Chief Justice Roberts and Justice Kennedy have also expressed concern with quid pro quo corruption resulting from super PACs. Following the filing of the complaint, [Free Speech For People filed on November 4, 2016, a lawsuit in federal court](#) in Washington, DC against the FEC to abolish super PACs. [Click here to read the Washington Post article covering this filing.](#)

We are joined in this filing by the Campaign for Accountability and by a bipartisan group of distinguished scholars and practitioners in the law of the First Amendment, corruption, and government ethics: Professor Laurence Tribe (Harvard Law School); Professor Albert Alschuler (Univ. of Chicago Law School, emeritus); Ambassador (ret.) Norman Eisen (former chief ethics counsel to President Barack Obama); and Professor Richard Painter (Univ. of Minnesota Law School, and former chief ethics counsel to President George W. Bush). In addition, we are honored to be representing a bipartisan coalition of Members of Congress and 2016 congressional candidates in this FEC complaint, including Senator Jeff Merkley (D-OR), Representative Ted Lieu (D-CA-33), and Representative Walter Jones (R-NC-3). [Click here](#) to view the video from our press conference announcing the FEC complaint filing.

The FEC did not respond to the complaint with an initial vote to proceed or ruling by the required deadline. Therefore, we have launched the next phase of the legal challenge to compel a ruling from the FEC. We are in the process of determining a case management schedule with the FEC to proceed with the complaint.

St. Petersburg, Florida: Challenging super PACs and foreign corporate money in US elections

Federal law prohibits foreign nationals from directly or indirectly influencing our elections. [In July 2016, Free Speech For People launched a campaign in St. Petersburg, Florida,](#) to press for the passage of an ordinance by the St. Petersburg City Council which would abolish super PACs and end foreign corporate money in local elections. Free Speech For People drafted this ordinance and worked closely in this campaign with St. Petersburg City Councilwoman Darden Rice, who introduced this ordinance before the City Council in partnership with American Promise-Tampa

Bay and the League of Women Voters of the St. Petersburg Area. The [St. Petersburg City Council voted 6-1 to move forward](#) for consideration our proposed ordinance, which is the first of its kind in the nation.

[Click here to read a recent op-ed in the Tampa Bay Times](#) co-authored by Scott Greytak, former Counsel for Free Speech For People, and Councilwoman Rice, which outlines this proposed ordinance and why it is necessary to protect the integrity of St. Petersburg elections.

The recent vote by the St. Petersburg City Council to consider this proposed ordinance is a key initial victory. On October 27, 2016, Free Speech For People provided testimony in support of the ordinance to the St. Petersburg City Council at a meeting of the “Committee of the Whole”. The ordinance will next be considered at an upcoming Committee of the Whole Meeting of the St. Petersburg City Council on April 20, 2017.

This legislative effort has led to the engagement of the St. Petersburg community in a grassroots movement to secure the integrity of local elections. The campaign in St. Petersburg is further supported by the website launched by Free Speech For People, www.defendourdemocracy.org, to serve as an informational and organizing hub for individuals and organizations in Florida and elsewhere around the country, including for those who might want to duplicate this approach in their own cities and states.

Similar bills regarding foreign corporate spending have now been introduced in Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Washington State. Free Speech For People is working with Connecticut State Senator Ted Kennedy, Jr. on S.B. 582, an act to end super PACs and prohibit foreign corporate money in Connecticut elections. Free Speech For People President, [John Bonifaz, provided expert testimony](#) on S.B. 582 to the Connecticut General Assembly’s Government Administration and Elections Committee at a public hearing on February 27, 2017.

The introduction of legislation regarding foreign corporate spending in elections will set up a new test case challenging the *Speechnow* ruling before the Supreme Court, and result in a ruling by the Court on a significant doctrine underlying *Citizens United*. Further, the challenge is tailored to appeal to a justice on the *Citizens United* majority. Foreign political spending is a concern to at least two of the justices on the *Citizens United* majority. In *Citizens United* itself, Justice Kennedy noted that the Court’s decision would not affect laws “preventing foreign individuals or associations from influencing our Nation’s political process.” And when President Obama warned in his 2010 State of the Union address that the decision could open the door to foreign political influence, Justice Samuel Alito famously mouthed “Not true.”

Crucially, at least one (maybe more) of the *Citizens United* justices voted to uphold a campaign finance law in the 2012 Supreme Court decision called *Bluman v. FEC*. In *Bluman*, the Court upheld a longstanding federal ban on “foreign nationals” contributing to, or spending any amount of money in federal, state, or local elections. While the Court’s opinion didn’t report who voted how, the composition of the *Bluman* Court was exactly the same as the *Citizens United* Court. In other words, at least one of the justices on the *Citizens United* majority voted to *strike down* a ban on *corporate* political spending, but to *uphold* a ban on *foreign* political spending.

The challenge to foreign corporate spending was designed to leverage a constitutional principle already upheld by the same justices who voted for *Citizens United* (allowing prohibitions on political spending by foreign nationals) to prevent those same foreign nationals from using the corporate

form to influence elections through corporate political spending.

Challenging the private financing of judicial elections

Free Speech For People is preparing to launch, in partnership with North Carolina Voters for Clean Elections and several other North Carolina-based organizations, a federal lawsuit in North Carolina challenging the private financing of judicial elections on due process grounds. The lawsuit will rely on growing empirical data demonstrating that litigants in the North Carolina court system who are not donors to judicial candidates are often denied their constitutional due process rights to a fair trial when they appear before those elected judges.

Judicial elections have undergone a sea change in the last two decades. Spending on these contests—once confined to a small pool of donors—has skyrocketed, creating a public perception that judges are beholden not to the law, but to the interests of those who helped them reach the bench. Survey data collected since this change began confirms that the prevalence of money in judicial elections undermines the public’s confidence in the integrity of the courts.

Free Speech For People’s legal challenge seeks to help turn the tide against these trends. Brought in North Carolina federal court, our lawsuit will seek a declaratory judgment from the court that the state’s current system of private financing of judicial elections violates the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the US Constitution.

In addition, a case challenging the private financing of judicial elections can be successful before the Supreme Court. Chief Justice Roberts and Justice Kennedy both have written opinions treating the issue of money in politics differently in the judicial elections context. In 2009, Justice Kennedy wrote the *Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal Co.* decision. That case involved a West Virginia Supreme Court Justice who had been elected thanks to direct contributions and massive outside spending by a party to a pending case. When the newly-elected state supreme court justice refused to recuse himself from the case, the U.S. Supreme Court held that this failure to recuse violated the federal Due Process Clause by creating a risk of bias.

In 2015, Chief Justice Roberts wrote the *Williams-Yulee v. Florida Bar* decision. He upheld a Florida rule that prohibited judicial candidates from personally soliciting campaign contributions. In writing for the majority, Chief Justice Roberts upheld the rule based on the public interest in preserving and promoting “public confidence in the integrity of the judiciary.” As he saw it, the sight of judges seeking political contributions could damage that public confidence.

We began preparing the case assuming that Justice Kennedy and/or Chief Justice Roberts were potential swing justices who view campaign financing differently in the judicial elections context. If successful, this case will dramatically impact state systems across the country where judicial elections are increasingly dominated by big money interests.

Building New Scholarship and Support for a New Jurisprudence

We continue to build support for a new jurisprudence within the legal community, advancing new scholarship and convening a series of legal symposia with leading scholars from across the country. These convenings have included:

- “Democracy by the People: Reforming Campaign Finance in America Today,” an all-day symposium in April 2016, at Seton Hall School of Law in Newark, New Jersey, with Justice Cheri Beasley of the North Carolina Supreme Court serving as keynote speaker. [Videos of the panel presentations and keynote address](#) were made available on our website, blog, and social media.
- “Corporations, the Constitution, and Democracy,” an all-day symposium in November 2015, at Loyola Law School in Los Angeles, California, with a [keynote address](#) delivered by The Honorable Leo E. Strine, Jr., Chief Justice of the Delaware Supreme Court. [Videos of the full symposium can be found here.](#)
- “Ending Super PACs: Is the *Speechnow* Ruling Vulnerable?,” a panel discussion in November 2015 at Harvard Law School with Harvard Law Professor Laurence Tribe, University of Chicago Law Professor Albert Alschuler, and Seton Hall Law Professor Mark Alexander. [The video of that forum is available here.](#)
- “Money in Politics as a Civil Rights Issue,” a panel discussion in October 2015 at the Hayti Heritage Center in Durham, North Carolina, with North Carolina Supreme Court Justice Cheri Beasley; Nicole Austin-Hillery of the Brennan Center for Justice; Professor Guy-Uriel Charles of Duke Law School; Chris Kromm of the Institute for Southern Studies, and North Carolina State Senator Floyd McKissick, Jr. [Two videos featuring excerpts from this forum can be accessed here.](#)
- “Advancing a New Jurisprudence for American Self-Government and Democracy,” an all-day symposium in November 2014, at Harvard Law School, with a keynote address by Senator John Tester of Montana. *Constitutional Commentary*, a prestigious law journal focusing on constitutional law, subsequently published key papers from the symposium in a special issue: [“Money, Politics, Corporations & the Constitution.”](#)

Continuing to help lead the movement for a 28th Amendment

Our innovative and cutting-edge work in the courts is on a parallel track with our continued work to help lead the movement for a 28th Amendment to reclaim our democracy. With our launch on the day of the *Citizens United* ruling, we helped to catalyze this movement and we have played an instrumental role in many of the victories to date, with 18 states and more than 725 cities and towns on record in support of a constitutional amendment, and with the historic Senate vote in September 2014 where 54 Senators voted in support of the Democracy For All Amendment. We are actively engaged today with coalition partners in the states to press for ballot initiatives and legislative resolutions which call for a 28th Amendment. We also continue to provide critical legal support to this movement, making the constitutional arguments why a 28th Amendment is necessary to defend our democracy.

The poll tax story is an important historical example of why the fight in the courts and the fight for a constitutional amendment are complementary and so necessarily intertwined. In 1937 and 1951, poor voters challenged the poll tax in court on equal protection grounds. Each time, the Supreme Court upheld the poll tax as constitutional. Then, in 1964, in the heat of the Civil Rights Movement, the nation enacted the 24th Amendment to the Constitution forever banning poll taxes in federal elections. Two years later, in 1966, the Supreme Court reviewed the poll tax for the third time and finally got it right, striking down the poll tax on equal protection grounds (*Harper v. Virginia Board of*

Elections). (There remained four Southern states that had held onto the poll tax for their state elections and Virginia was one of them, leading to that third case.) Our fight for a 28th Amendment similarly underlies our work in the courts for a new jurisprudence.

Serving as a Key Legal Resource for the Democracy Movement

Free Speech For People serves as a key legal resource for the growing movement for a 28th Amendment to reclaim our democracy. We led the fight before the California Supreme Court to ensure that California voters would have the opportunity to vote in the November election on a statewide ballot measure calling for a constitutional amendment. We have provided key expert advice and expert testimony to elected officials and activist leaders focused on advancing resolutions at the state and local level supporting the 28th Amendment. We worked closely with US Senator Tom Udall's Office and the US Senate Judiciary Committee in the drafting of the Democracy For All Amendment and in the legal and public education work leading up to the US Senate's historic vote on that amendment in September 2014. We have advanced the legal arguments for why a 28th Amendment is necessary to defend our democracy.

In September 2016, we expanded further our capacity to carry out this work across the country with the hiring of Jasmine Gomez as our 2016-2018 Democracy Honors Fellow. Ms. Gomez works with organizations and activists across the country, providing legal support for the movement for a 28th Amendment to the Constitution.

The Growing Power of the Amendment Movement

The constitutional amendment movement continues to gain momentum nationwide. In the past year, our campaign for a 28th amendment achieved the following:

- On June 15, 2016, New York became the 17th state to call for a constitutional amendment to the US Constitution to overturn the Supreme Court's Citizens United ruling. Free Speech For People worked with a broad coalition of organizational allies and local partners to secure bipartisan support in the New York legislature for a joint letter to Congress urging that it pass a 28th amendment to the Constitution.
- On November 8, 2016, Washington State became the 18th state to call for a constitutional amendment through the successful passage of Initiative 735. We worked in support of the ballot measure, providing legal expertise and communications and outreach support, with the Washington Coalition to Amend to the Constitution (WAMEND).
- In California, Free Speech For People worked closely with our local organizational partner, Money Out Voters In, to support the 'Overturn Citizens United Act' -- a statewide measure on the November 2016 ballot - through a grassroots public education and communications campaign. The ballot measure was successfully passed by California voters on November 8, 2016.

Free Speech For People's Leadership in Building A Transpartisan Movement To Reclaim Our Democracy

Since our founding, Free Speech For People has made the case for the deleterious effect of money in politics across the political spectrum. With our, 'Across the Aisle' report and accompanying website, acrosstheaisle.us, we highlight more than 100 Republican leaders speaking out in support of overturning Citizens United. These leaders join 80% of voters, of all party affiliations, calling for a 28th amendment to get big money out of politics. We continue to build transpartisan support for the movement to reclaim our democracy through the following:

- Representing a bipartisan coalition of Members of Congress and 2016 congressional candidates in our FEC complaint to challenge Speechnow;
- Assisting in securing bipartisan support in state legislatures and local governing bodies which are considering 28th Amendment resolutions;
- Engaging in targeted outreach to conservative media to advance the argument why conservatives should support an amendment.

How we collaborate with our allies and our unique leadership in the field

Free Speech For People collaborates with key allies nationwide in the democracy movement, and in advancing a new jurisprudence in defense of our democracy. We value these critical partnerships with our allies on the issues and approaches in which we find common ground. In addition to working alongside partners in the democracy movement, Free Speech For People is forging our own path through the development of original and innovative legal and organizing strategies, based on informed and studied expert analysis. We pursue such trailblazing strategies, while simultaneously engaging and sharing with our allies our unique approach to reclaiming democracy for the people. We engage in significant collaboration with Represent.Us, American Constitution Society, Demos, Brennan Center for Justice, Campaign Legal Center, People For the American Way, Public Citizen, Common Cause, US PIRG, Greenpeace, Campaign for Accountability, American Promise, the League of Women Voters of the St. Petersburg Area, and Money Out Voters In, among others.

While we work closely with and respect our core allies in the democracy movement, Free Speech For People has demonstrated unique leadership in helping to catalyze and build the constitutional amendment movement, in advancing new and innovative litigation strategies to challenge recent judicial rulings which threaten our democracy, and in expanding support for defending our Republic across the political spectrum. Given our track record and leadership, Free Speech For People is especially qualified to lead new initiatives to broaden further the support of Americans of widely diverse politics and demographics for overturning *Citizens United*, enacting critical reform, and restoring democracy to the people.

Our legal advocacy work creates new strategic alliances for the broader movement by connecting the democracy movement to various other social change movements. Since the launch of our Legal Advocacy Program, we have created new partnerships with allies including the American Sustainable Business Council, Auburn Theological Seminary, Hollender Sustainable Brands, Missourians Organized for Reform and Empowerment, Equal Justice Society, the National Center for Lesbian Rights, EarthRights International, Courage Campaign, and Global Witness.

Free Speech For People's Communications Strategy

Our media and communications outreach is a core element of all of our work. Free Speech For People has continued to expand its digital, radio, television, and print media presence, building on our success as an effective public education and advocacy leader for the democracy movement. The report attached to this proposal highlights many of our key media placements in 2016 and 2017.

In 2017, we will focus our media and communications outreach on four primary goals:

- 1) Expanding our digital audience through video, social media, and digital campaigning;
- 2) Continuing to educate the American public about the threats that unlimited campaign spending, the fabricated doctrine of corporate constitutional rights, and corruption at the highest levels of government pose to our democracy, through our organizational website, which serves as the hub of our educational and advocacy resources; direct email communications; and social media;
- 3) Continuing to grow and diversify our print, radio, and television media placement and to expand opportunities for public speaking for key staff and allies, and outreach across the country;
- 4) Amplifying and lifting up the voices of everyday Americans across online, radio, television, and print media platforms to demonstrate the consensus in the country about taking on big money in politics and unchecked corporate power, and to challenge the false narrative that there is a partisan divide on a 28th amendment to overturn *Citizens United*.

Finances

The annual organizational budget for Free Speech For People for 2017 is \$1,382,671. This budget reflects the current staffing costs for key principals, as well as new staffing for our communications work. It also reflects the costs of expanding our communications outreach, and preparing and filing legal briefs.

We have raised more than \$6 million since launching Free Speech For People in January 2010. Our funders have included: Amalgamated Transit Union, The Clements Foundation, Cloud Mountain Foundation, Endeavor Foundation, French American Charitable Trust, Foundation to Promote Open Society, Gaia Fund, Laura Stratton Dewey Foundation, Mertz Gilmore Foundation, Namaste Solar Foundation, Overbrook Foundation, Park Foundation, Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Rockefeller Family Fund, Schumann Media Center, Sister Fund, Stewart R. Mott Foundation, WhyNot Initiative, and the William B. Wiener, Jr. Foundation. In addition, we have raised more than \$1.5 million in support from individual donors.

Conclusion

Through our innovative legal advocacy work advancing a new jurisprudence, through our catalyzing and leadership work pressing for a 28th Amendment, and through our campaigns to challenge corruption at the highest levels of government, Free Speech For People serves at the forefront of the movement to reclaim our democracy. We continue to build further our track record of unique leadership as we join with millions of Americans across the country seeking to fulfill the promise of political equality for all and the vision of self-government: of, by, and for the people.